**IP establishment form**

Research Site: ***Endamohini, Sinana, Lemo and Debre Brehan***

Place of Meeting: ***Respective Woredas***

Level at which activity is held: Strategic/Operational**- *Strategic/Woreda/***

Date of the activity: **February-March, 2014**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Levels** | **Category where IP**  **falls** | **Remarks/explain** |
| How has the IP been  formed (Origin) | IP started from scratch |  | Briefly explain the process of establishing the IP in 150 words  ***All IPs in all the research sites were established from the scratch with a participatory stakeholder analysis. Potential IP members jointly identified by ILRI and local partners were listed and endorsed on the first establishment meeting. Local institutions that were agreed to* be *potential members but were not represented on the establishment meeting were agreed to be contacted* after *the establishment meeting. Terms of reference (ToR) that outlines the IP structure, purpose and function, and the members’ role was developed and dispatched to each member institution. It was on the establishment meeting that institutional representatives (IP members) selection was initiated but the process was assumed to continue as we expect new partnership and member turnover.*** |
|  | IP builds on existing networks (e.g. previous IPs, government/community structures) |  |
|  | IP already fully existed |  |
| What is the structure  of the IP | Structured with elaborate procedures for running the IP |  | Briefly indicate how the IP is structured e.g. which officials were appointed, any sub groups within the IPs, at which administrative levels the IP has been formed e.g. Woreda, Kebele- in 150 words  ***A total of four Woreda level and eight Kebele level IPs were established in all the research sites. The Woreda level IPs are supposed to give strategic focus and support to the Kebele level IPs-so are called Strategic Innovation Platforms. The Kebele level IPs are named ‘operational IPs’ as all research operations that they are expected to support are undertaken at the kebele level. Within each IP Technical group (TG) members were selected to better facilitate the IPs contribution to the research and development work. TG members (5-8 in number) are representatives of key stakeholders in each site. The members are supposed to meet more frequently to oversee, evaluate and reflect on the action research which otherwise would have been difficult for IP members who are meeting 3-4 times a year. A mix of administrators and experts were agreed to be members of the platform whereby both play a major role in local policy support and technical advice respectively. To insure farmers’ voice is heard, they are represented on both the operational and strategic level IPs from each ‘innovation clusters’ that are voluntary grouped based on the type of research/enterprise that they are participating.*** |
|  | Not structured |  |
| Facilitation | Facilitated by Africa RISING IP team |  | Briefly describe how the IPs will be facilitated  ***At the beginning the AR IP team leads on facilitation until local partners takeover. In principle AR IP team facilitation role decreases as partners role in it increases. Eventually, It is envisaged to see AR/ILRI’s role to be more of a technical backstop. The facilitation role rotates between IP member institutions throughout the life time of the IPs.*** |
|  | Facilitated by other local stakeholders |  |
|  | Joint/Alternating facilitation |  |
| Commons objective/  issues | Have common issue/ objective/problem being identified |  | If yes, what is the common  issue/objective  ***In line with the broader objective of AR’s ‘sustainable intensification’ of Ethiopian highlands farming system seven research teams were identified based on a number of diagnostic studies conducted by the AR. Although the IPs were formally established after the diagnostic studies, key local partners (Research centers, Universities and Gov. agri. offices) who later became nucleus for the IP participated in problem identification and prioritization. The lowest level of the IP structure-‘Innovation clusters- are grouped under a common research agenda and all the research agendas/protocols belong to the woreda and kebele level IPs due to the systemic nature of AR research interventions. But better IP members’ participation in identification and prioritization of research problems could have been insured if the IP were established before implementation of the diagnostic studies.***  If No, what are diverging issues |
|  | Do not have a common issue/objective/problem being identified |  |
| Information sharing  mechanisms | Have clear information sharing mechanisms been identified |  | If yes, give list of information sharing mechanisms that have been agreed on  ***There is no communication strategy developed for AR IPs but IP members have identified about ten information sharing tools and mechanisms that would be used to disseminate information within and outside the IPs at both the Kebele and Woreda levels.*** |